

Date: Wed, 23 Mar 94 04:30:24 PST  
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>  
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu  
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu  
Precedence: Bulk  
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V94 #147  
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest                      Wed, 23 Mar 94                      Volume 94 : Issue    147

Today's Topics:

                    License Exam Fees  
                    Morse Whiners (3 msgs)  
                    Need Dayton room  
                    Rich has flipped out (was: Morse Whiners)

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>  
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>  
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available  
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text  
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official  
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

-----

Date: 22 Mar 94 13:15:05 GMT  
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!yeshua.marcam.com!zip.eecs.umich.edu!  
newsxfer.itd.umich.edu!news1.oakland.edu!news.nd.edu!bsu-cs!bsu-ucs.uucp!  
01tethomas@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: License Exam Fees  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

I am going to take the license exams at the Dayton Hamvention. I need to know  
the prevailing rates for the the novice and technician class licenses. Could  
someone send me some information on these rates or give me advise on where to  
get these rates.

Thank you

Trenton Thomas  
01tethomas@bsuvc.bsu.edu

-----

Date: Mon, 21 Mar 94 21:53:08 -0500  
From: yale.edu!noc.near.net!news.delphi.com!usenet@yale.arpa  
Subject: Morse Whiners  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Michael P. Deignan <md@maxcy2.maxcy.brown.edu> writes:

>two boxtops? At what point do we stand up and say "enough is enough",  
>and take the unpopular position of making people EARN their license.

There's one little problem with that -- all the license does is give BACK to the licensee what the Federal Government has TAKEN AWAY by law. Why should we have to EARN something that used to be ours anyway -- as opposed to simply showing that we have the knowledge to use the spectrum well?

-----

Date: Tue, 22 Mar 94 22:13:28 -0500  
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!noc.near.net!news.delphi.com!usenet@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: Morse Whiners  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Michael P. Deignan <md@maxcy2.maxcy.brown.edu> writes:

>Good, then let's take some frequency privs away from the entry-class  
>licenses. "Everything > 30mhz" is way too much for the "entry" level  
>codeless technician. What incentive is there to upgrade at that

Technician is NOT the entry level. Novice -- with DRASTICALLY limited operating authority -- is.

-----

Date: Wed, 23 Mar 1994 04:04:18 GMT  
From: brunix!pstc3.pstc.brown.edu!root@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: Morse Whiners  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Ed Ellers <edellers@delphi.com> writes:

> Technician is NOT the entry level. Novice -- with DRASTICALLY limited  
> operating authority -- is.

Uh, Ed, don't know where you've been for the past few years, but the No-Code tech is the de-facto entry-level license in Ham radio now. Ask any VEC for their testing statistics if you don't think so.

The no-code tech, by its very definition, was designed to be an entry-level license, since the only license you could get "below" a no-code tech was novice, and that had code, which was what the no-code tech was designed to eliminate, so you can't say the no-code tech ISN'T an entry-level license.

Your two entry-level routes into the hobby were either novice or no-code tech. Most people have chosen the latter.

Although, I guess technically you could call the no-code tech a non-entry level license, since the people who were supposed to be attracted to that license category were people who had no interest in code, and thus would never upgrade, so technically they were at the "top" of the license ladder, as far as their interests were concerned. But, that's another debate.

MD

-----  
Date: 22 Mar 1994 23:09:44 -0500  
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!news.intercon.com!udel!news.udel.edu!brahms.udel.edu!not-for-mail@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: Need Dayton room  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Please forgive the cross posting if you will.

I need a room for two for Thursday, Friday and Saturday night at Dayton. We have one room at the Hampton House with the FRC, and want one more closeby if possible.

CU at contest forum and dinner, FRC suite, hamfest etc.

Tnx Bob

--  
Bob Penneys, WN3K Frankford Radio Club Internet: penneys@pecan.cns.udel.edu  
Work: Ham Radio Outlet (Delaware) (800) 644-4476; fax (302) 322-8808  
Mail at home: 12 East Mill Station Drive Newark, DE 19711 USA

-----  
Date: Wed, 23 Mar 94 06:06:56 GMT  
From: netcomsv!netcomsv!skyld!jangus@decwrl.dec.com  
Subject: Rich has flipped out (was: Morse Whiners)

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <Cn2Is7.LMG@murdoch.acc.Virginia.EDU> jeg7e@Hopper.itc.Virginia.EDU writes:

Commenting on Jeff Herman and sums it up with...

> I don't (hardly) expect you to be able to understand this.

Be careful Jon, or Brian will start killing your postings as well.

|  |  |                              |
|--|--|------------------------------|
| Amateur: WA6FWI@WA6FWI.#SOCA.CA.USA.NA |  | "You have a flair for adding |
| Internet: jangus@skyld.grendel.com     |  | a fanciful dimension to any  |
| US Mail: PO Box 4425 Carson, CA 90749  |  | story."                      |
| Phone: 1 (310) 324-6080                |  | Peking Noodle Co.            |

-----  
Date: Tue, 22 Mar 94 09:08:13 -0500  
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!library.ucla.edu!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!noc.near.net!news.delphi.com!usenet@network.ucsd.edu  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <2mii21\$h0v@ccnet.ccnet.com>, <p6z0gPq.edellers@delphi.com>,  
<1994Mar21.143942.23165@cs.brown.edu>  
Subject : Re: Coord. priority for open repeaters

Michael P. Daignan <md@maxcy2.maxcy.brown.edu> writes:

>Gee, great logic. Shut down a machine that hundreds of people use just  
>because one person shows up.

No, turn it off TEMPORARILY. Wait a few minutes, then bring it back up. If the guy is doing something that's against the rules you're REQUIRED to shut down; the same principle holds for a "mere" nuisance.

-----  
Date: 22 Mar 1994 06:56 EDT  
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!dog.ee.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!news.umbc.edu!haven.umd.edu!cs.umd.edu!newsfeed.gsfc.nasa.gov!nssdca.gsfc.nasa.gov!stocker@network.  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1994Mar18.211656.18218@cs.brown.edu>,  
<RFM.94Mar18153733@urth.eng.sun.com>, <Cn1Jys.28z@news.Hawaii.Edu>sf  
Subject : Re: Rich has flipped out (was: Morse Whiners)

In article <Cn1Jys.28z@news.Hawaii.Edu>, jherman@uhunix3.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu (Jeffrey Herman) writes...

>In article <RFM.94Mar18153733@urth.eng.sun.com> rfm@urth.eng.sun.com (Richard McAllister) writes:

>>In article <1994Mar18.211656.18218@cs.brown.edu> md@maxcy2.maxcy.brown.edu (Michael P. Deignan) writes:

>>>I guess this is what differentiates me from other people. I was brought up  
>>>to believe that one should work hard, and rewards will follow.

>>

>>Ah, that explains it. You were apparently raised by Marxists who taught  
>>you the labor theory of value, which I believe is generally discredited  
>>even among liberals these days.

>

>Oh my. Do you mean to say that the work ethic our country was founded upon  
>is based on Marxist theory? Really? In those countries that subscribe  
>to Marx-Lenin-Maoist ideals can a diligent worker there achieve anything  
>close to what a diligent worker here achieves? I guess the millions who have  
>been slaughtered this century in the name of Marxism just didn't work  
>hard enough, huh Rich?

[stuff deleted]

>

>

>Jeff NH6IL

>

Well! As a matter of fact the work ethic as practiced by capitalism is not the work ethic as preached by the puritains. In captialism, regardless of how hard the work, the pay is not necessarily commensurate with it. Ergo, the late 19th and early 20th century where workers including children were working up to 16 hrs a day with extremely low pay. You might be interested in the congressional records of hearing on these issues. Here we had an example of people working tremendously hard and not getting any reward for their labors.

On the other hand during this same period, capitalistics like JP Morgan, John Ford, John Rockefeller, et al were doing very little work and getting very richly rewarded for it. Why? The general answer is "ideas" and "risk". This individuals supposedly had an outstanding idea and were willing to take financial, and sometimes personal, risks to bring about their ideas. As a result, the purtain ethic was also subverted to say that their success in such risk taking was a sign that they were among the "favored".

Generally, in our western society it is not the individual who works hard who gets ahead but the individual who is willing to take risks whether or not they work hard. I know a lot of small business people who work very hard (sometimes up to 18 hours a day) and they are not doing nearly as well as

the chairman of GM who led his company into decline. When one asks why, the answer is risk. The GM chair supposedly had greater risk and therefore greater responsibility than the small business person. This supposedly is true even though the small business person did all his own work while the GM chairman is living off the labors of his workers.

The whole concept of "work ethic" is considerably more complicated than the simplistic answers and principles stated by the various posters. Also, they have very little if anything to do with the efficacy of CW in radio communications.

Erich  
N3OXM

-----  
Date: Mon, 21 Mar 1994 17:36:12 GMT  
From: ncar!csn!cherokee!walter!dancer.cc.bellcore.com!not-for-mail@ames.arpa  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <BUzP4Jj.edellers@delphi.com>, <2mii21\$h0v@ccnet.ccnet.com>,  
<p6z0gPq.edellers@delphi.com>  
Subject : Re: Coord. priority for open repeaters

In article <p6z0gPq.edellers@delphi.com>,  
Ed Ellers <edellers@delphi.com> wrote:  
>Bob Wilkins n6fri <rwilkins@ccnet.com> writes:

>>I know that packet stations can reserve the right to lock out lids using  
>>the good BUDDy list, I am not familiar with how voice repeaters can  
>>effect the same operation. How does your repeater lock out Lids?

>The way voice repeaters would lock out lids is to shut down as soon as they  
>hear the creep, then come back up later. If that fails, it seems to me that  
>the trustee can write to the guy, tell him that he is not welcome on the  
>repeater, and that if he attempts to use it again that he'll be reported to  
>the FCC -- which, as has been noted, most certainly allows repeater trustees  
>to exercise control.

Not sure why I'm jumping into this discussion, but...I see nothing  
that the FCC can be asked to do if a legally licensed amateur  
continues to access any repeater. If the input/output frequency  
is idle, then anyone can use that frequency. Sure, the control  
operator can shut down the system, but there's nothing in Part 97  
that prohibits legal operation by anyone just because a repeater  
is closed. Again, this assumes that the "lid" is a licensed  
ham. Also, this assumes the "lid" is operating in an acceptable  
manner (i.e. This is XXXX listening, or some other standard

operating procedure). I really doubt that the FCC has any legal standing to forbid an amateur from accessing any repeater just because the control operator doesn't want that person to use it. Again, nothing in my statements should be viewed as supporting jamming, malicious interference, etc.

Just my .02

Standard Disclaimer- Any opinions, etc. are mine and NOT my employer's.

-----  
Bill Sohl (K2UNK) BELLCORE (Bell Communications Research, Inc.)  
Morristown, NJ                      email via UUCP                      bcr!cc!whs70  
201-829-2879 Weekdays              email via Internet              whs70@cc.bellcore.com  
-----

Date: Wed, 23 Mar 1994 04:41:12 GMT  
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!dog.ee.lbl.gov!newshub.nosc.mil!crash!beacons!  
kevin@network.ucsd.edu  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <CMvu1M.JyM@ucdavis.edu>, <2mdgcc\$4g5@paperboy.ids.net>,  
<pA7NoFX.cecilmoore@delphi.com>  
Subject : Re: Morse Whiners

In article <pA7NoFX.cecilmoore@delphi.com> Cecil Moore <cecilmoore@delphi.com>  
writes:

>... In my opinion, photons are not commerce. I  
>believe that radio spectrum, just like land, should have originally belonged  
>to the individuals who homesteaded it. They, in turn, should have had the  
>right to sell it. The federal government expropriated the radio spectrum  
>just like it expropriates land for its own use and expropriates half my  
>income for uses with which I disagree.

Thank goodness this is not the way the airwaves are managed. If  
it were, we would have lost \*all\* our spectrum long ago to commercial  
interests.

Think of our spectrum as a national forest. It exists for all  
amateurs to use, experiment with, and serve the public with. You need  
a permit to camp in a national forest, and we must have a license to  
operate the amateur bands. Now the camping permit does not prevent  
the land from being abused, but it does provide some amount of  
accountability for those who camp there. Abusing national forest land  
violates the public trust and jeopardizes the privilege for everyone,  
and allowing the ham bands to be abused will have the same effect.

If it were not for the government controlling the airwaves, the  
Amateur Service simply would not exist today.

Kevin Sanders, KN6FQ  
kevin@beacons.cts.com

```
-----  
| o o \_/ o o |  
| o o @ o o |  
|-----|
```

Try Boatanchors  
For A Real Lift

-----  
Date: Mon, 21 Mar 1994 18:50:35 GMT  
From: elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!swrinde!news.dell.com!natinst.com!cs.utexas.edu!uwm.edu!  
mixcom.com!kevin.jessup@ames.arpa  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1994Mar16.004115.60406@ns1.cc.lehigh.edu>,  
<jhobson.39.2D8709FE@su19f.ess.harris.com>, <2m86ho\$6f1@oak.oakland.edu>xcom  
Subject : Re: The Dirty words????

In <2m86ho\$6f1@oak.oakland.edu> prvalko@vela.acs.oakland.edu (prvalko) writes:

> Seventythrees (Best Regardses to you, too!)

The one that really gets to me is "My very best 73s!".

My very best best regardses???

Yeah, right! And my very most 73s to you, good buddy! ;-))

Enough for now, I'm destinated...

delineated,

declinated,

demented,

devastated,

and constipated!

--

```
/`- _      kevin.jessup@mixcom.com  
{      }/    Marquette Electronics, Inc  
\  
|__*|    N9SQB, ARRL, Amateur Radio  
          N9SQB @ WD9ANY.#MKE.WI.USA.NA
```



-----

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #147

\*\*\*\*\*

\*\*\*\*\*